## For the Northern District of California

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1	1					
2	2					
3	3					
4	4					
5	5					
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT					
7	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA					
8						
9	AMERICAN HONDA MOTOR CO., INC.,					
10	Plaintiff,	No. C 06-04752 JSW				
11	1 v.	ORDER SETTING TELEPHONIC				
12	THE COAST DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM, INC.,	HEARING ON COAST'S MOTION TO CONTINUE CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEFING OR				
13	Defendant.	ODER COMPLIANCE AND GRANTING MOTION TO HEAR				
14	4	MATTER ON SHORTENED TIME				

The Court has received the Motion to Extend Deadlines for Claim Construction Briefing Pending Honda's Compliance With Court Order, or in the Alternative to Order Compliance by August 30, 2007 filed by Defendant The Coast Distribution System, Inc. ("Coast"). This matter is fully briefed and ripe for resolution. Accordingly, Coast's motion to hear this matter on shortened time (Docked No. 87) is GRANTED.

The parties shall appear for a telephonic hearing on August 29, 2007 at 1:45 p.m. Counsel for each side shall contact the Court's Courtroom Deputy, Jennifer Ottolini, to provide her with a landline on which counsel can be reached by no later than 9:00 a.m. on August 29, 2007.

The Court does not intend the parties to re-argue the positions set forth in their brief, nor shall they submit any additional authorities on this issue. Rather, the parties shall be prepared to address the following questions:

1. In its reply brief, Coast asserts that Honda has not yet set forth preliminary infringement contentions as to "the KG144 and KG 158 engines." Does Honda

	ı
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

dispute that assertion?	If so, where in	n the Preliminary	Infringement	Contentions
can the Court find a ref	ference to thos	e specific engine	numbers?	

- 2. Even if Honda has not yet identified these engines in its preliminary infringement contentions, how will identification alter the current claim construction briefing? That is, will additional terms be at issue other than those terms to which the parties have agreed? Will additional claims be at issue, such that the Court would be required to look to how terms are used in claims that have not yet been asserted to inform its decision on claim construction?
  - a. If preliminary infringement contentions will not affect either the claim terms or the claims at issue, what is Coast's best argument that it cannot complete claim construction briefing without knowing Honda's position on these engines?

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 28, 2007

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE